



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/385,229 02/08/95 JACOBS

18M2/0621

IMMUNEX CORP  
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT  
51 UNIVERSITY STREET  
SEATTLE WA 98101

C 2503-A  
EXAMINER

NTSBET, T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1/3

1806

DATE MAILED: 06/21/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 2/8/95 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned, 35 U.S.C. 133

**Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.        | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.             | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.       |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/>   |

**Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION**

1. ☒ Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims 7 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

### III. DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment filed 2/8/95 is acknowledged. Examination continues for claims 1-6 and 8-9. Claim 7 remains withdrawn from consideration as drawn to a distinct invention, election having been made by applicants in Paper No. 8, filed 8/16/93. No further amendment has been made to claims 1-6 and 8-9.
2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately describe and failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the instant invention.

- The specification recites the following on page 3 at line 14.
- "soluble TNFR molecules include, for example, analogs or subunits of native proteins having at least 20 amino acids and which exhibit at least some biological activity in common with TNFRI, TNFRII, or TNF binding proteins....Equivalent soluble TNFRs include polypeptides which vary from these sequences by one or more

substitutions, deletions, or additions and which retain the ability to bind TNF or inhibit TNF signal transduction activity via cell surface bound TNF receptor proteins....". The specification goes on to refer to proteins having "sufficient homology" without really providing the routineer with an exact definition of how such homology is to be determined. Without such guidance, undue experimentation would be required to determine which of the "substantially homologous" proteins fall within applicant's disclosure.

Review of Figures 3 and 4 of the data of Table B does not indicate that the  $F_c$  /TNFr fusions are statistically significant when compared with saline. Note that figuring the standard deviation into the data reveals that the figures could be the same. Similar results are shown in Tables C and D. Note that Table D shows the same severity score for the TNFr/ $F_c$  as PBS. The day of onset is only accurate to +/- 6 days. That is not accurate to really show that the  $F_c$  postpones the onset of arthritis in rats. The data in figures 3 and 4 show similar results. Accordingly, applicants have not really provided data which supports their claims that the  $F_c$ /TNFr fusions alone provide treatment for arthritis.

In the response filed 5/5/94, applicants argue that the specification at various positions states that the different mutations and at page 7 provides specific guidance to the routineer to adequately make and use the disclosed invention. Applicants conclude that the specification enables testing with a

number of well known methods.

Such arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. The specification does contain specific description of a variety of alterations of the TNFr molecules. However, the description is limited at the C-terminus to deletions to amino acid 142. Therefore, applicants have not teachings concerning the molecule past amino acid 142. Accordingly, a broad reading of the specification disclosed as "variants" or "derivatives" is not supported by sufficient intermediate disclosure to define all derivatives. Therefore, in response to applicant's arguments and the specification at page 7, the disclosure is considered sufficient only for C terminal deletions up to amino acids 142. Likewise, the N terminal alterations of amino terminal residues Leu, Pro, and Ala is considered sufficient. However, the random alteration of residues between amino acids 3 and 142 is not supported. Moreover conservative substitutions are also not considered enabled without the practice of undue experimentation. Such a conclusion of non-enablement is reached because applicants have not disclosed a discrete assay to which provides an endpoint for the treatment. In other words, in order to test the "variants" or "derivatives" set forth in the specification, some quantifiable assay must be provided to establish functionality. Applicant's arguments that binding is all that is required is not sufficient because binding alone has not been shown to establish *in vivo* functionality. It is noted that the disclosed invention is a method of treatment, not a product which could have *in vitro*

assays. Therefore a different kind of endpoint must be established. Moreover, applicant's *in vivo* data is not conclusively correlated with a reduction in disease. If applicants wish to include different TNFr muteins not actually made, then applicants must provide a specific assay which has been correlated with the method of treatment.

3. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brennan et al.

The claims recite the use of a TNF antagonist in the mediation of TNF associated arthritis. The claims are not limited to the type of antagonist.

The Brennan reference teaches the inhibition of IL1 production in explanted synovial cell cultures from arthritic human patients. The reduction in the production of IL1 is consistent with the reduction in bone damage and cartilage destruction associated with rheumatoid arthritis. Note that the reference teaches on pg. 244 first paragraph, "...intra-articular IL1 can induce arthritis.". Therefore, since the source of the synovial cell culture is the human patient, the reference anticipates the rejected claims.

Applicants argue that each and every element of the claimed invention must be taught for the claims to be anticipated. Since the claims recite TNF antagonists, the Brennan reference cannot

be used. Such an argument fails to account for the presence of the term "TNF binding protein" in the Markush Group of the claim. Since the antibody of Brennan is a protein and it binds TNF, the antibody is a "TNF binding protein" and the Markush Group is anticipated. Since that term still exists in the claims, the claims are still anticipated and the rejection is maintained.

5. Claims 4-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Brennan in view of Harris and Smith.

The claims recite the following limitations.

A method of treating TNF mediated arthritis with a TNFr.

The Brennan reference has been discussed in paragraph 18 of the §102 rejection. The reference is used as a teaching of expectation of the success because the reference explicitly states that IL1 can induce arthritis and that TNF  $\alpha$  inhibitors can reduce the production of IL1. The Brennan reference does not teach the use of TNF receptors. However, this is not considered significant because the TNF receptors of the instant claims and anti-TNF antibodies of Brennan operate by the same mechanism. That mechanism is the binding of TNF so that the TNF molecule cannot interact with other receptors, etc.. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known that as long as TNF is removed from the environment, the condition of rheumatoid patients would improve.

The Harris reference teaches the use of cytokine inhibitors for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis on page 1286, end of

the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph. Therefore, this reference is sufficient to provide the motivation to use the cytokine inhibitors of the instant invention.

The Smith reference provides the sequence of the p80TNFr which was used by applicants in the instant application. The use of such a receptor in the claimed method would have been obvious in view of the cited art set forth above.

The combination of the TNFr of Smith in the methods of therapy set forth in Harris and Brennan references would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art absent evidence to the contrary. The reason for such a conclusion stems from the following disclosures. Because the prior art teaches that an antagonist to TNF will prevent the cause of arthritis (Brennan) and the art recognizes that the claimed compounds were an alternative antagonist to the antibodies of Brennan (see Harris), the routineer would merely substitute the TNFr of Smith for the antibodies of Brennan as taught by Harris to obtain the claimed invention. Therefore, applicant's claimed invention is clearly prima facie obvious absent evidence to the contrary.

The last two claims recite specific dosage amounts and times. However, the dosages are so broad as to represent merely upper and lower extremes. In other words, given the fact that the claimed dose appears to be almost 20 times as strong as that used in the representative examples, the claimed doses reasonably appear to represent extreme dosage limits rather than a preferred dose critical to patentability. Therefore, absent some

clinical significance they are deemed to be obvious in view of the art.

Applicants respond in the 5/5/94 that the Harris and Smith references are not available as prior art. Applicants are not, however, entitled to priority necessary to enable the invention any earlier than the instant filing date. While applicants did disclose the combination of TNF inhibitors with antibody F<sub>c</sub> in previous applications, this disclosure was only in general terms and did not contain any detailed **enabling** disclosure which would teach the routineer how to make and/or use the instant invention. Accordingly, the rejection is maintained for reasons of record and applicants are not entitled to the priority date of anything earlier than the instant filing.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Brennan in view of Harris ,Capon ,and Hoogenboom further in view of Smith.

The rejected claim recites the use of a fusion F<sub>c</sub> region with the TNFr protein.

The Brennan, Harris, and Smith references have been discussed above.

The Capon and Hoogenboom references are added to render the addition of the F<sub>c</sub> region to the cytokine receptor (TNFr) obvious. The Capon reference teaches generically, the addition of various receptors and soluble derivatives of these receptors to N-terminus of the F<sub>c</sub> region. Moreover, the Capon reference teaches the advantages of using such things in the addition of F<sub>c</sub> regions



for drugs which interrupt ligand and binding partner interactions. See col 4, lines 16 and following. This is exactly what applicants are claiming. The claimed TNFr is a binding partner that is used to antagonize the interaction TNF (ligand) and the cell bound receptor (binding partner). The patent teaches that the addition of the F<sub>c</sub> region increases serum half life (see line 40 of col. 4). The Capon reference does not explicitly mention cytokines. That is why the Hoogenboom reference has been used. The Hoogenboom reference teaches the fusion of the TNFr ligand (TNF) to an immunoglobulin F<sub>c</sub> region. Therefore, all one of ordinary skill would have to do is substitute the binding partner for the ligand as explicitly recommended by Capon. Accordingly, because Capon teaches the fusion of F<sub>c</sub> with ligand antagonists (binding partners) and the Hoogenboom reference teaches the use of such fusions with the TNF/TNFr ligand/antagonist (binding partner) pair, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the fusions of Capon and Hoogenboom on the molecules of Smith with the methods of Brennan and Harris.

Applicants argue in the response filed 5/5/94 that the Capon reference fails to disclose the specific fusion of a TNF receptor to the F<sub>c</sub> immunoglobulin domain. Further, Capon is argued not to disclose the use of the TNF fusions in inflammation. In response, the Hoogenboom reference states on page 1027, right col., last paragraph, that TNF is a mediator of inflammation. Therefore, the prior art specifically teaches the use of the TNF binding protein

fusion proteins for use in treating inflammation. In so far as the Capon reference is concerned. Applicant's attention is directed to col. 2, lines 10 and following, for example. The reference teaches the use of many different hormones and growth factors. In short, the reference provides teaching of a wide variety of different receptors. Moreover, claim 2 is generic in claiming a variety of different receptors which generically include the instant TNF antagonists. Accordingly, the claim itself is presumed valid for the scope and therefore, absent unexpected results applicants specie is considered to be taught by the generic disclosure of Capon.

7. This is a File Wrapper Continuation of applicant's earlier application S.N. 07/946,236. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds or art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Serial No.: 08/385,229  
Art Unit: 1806

11

8. The oath is defective in the recitation of the prior application number 07/403,421 as being filed in 1985. The application was filed in 1989. A new oath is required to correct the defect.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Nisbet whose telephone number is (703) 308-4204 from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm weekdays with the exception of alternating Mondays. If the examiner cannot be reached, the supervisor, Margaret Moskowitz Parr, may be contacted at phone number (703)308-2454.

The number for facsimile submission of papers has changed. The new fax number for Art Unit 1806 is (703) 305-7401. Please provide the serial number, application title, examiner's name, and art unit on the fax cover sheet to expedite clerical processing. In addition, all cover sheets should be marked **DRAFT** or **OFFICIAL** as appropriate.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

TMN  
June 12, 1995

MARGARET PARR  
SUPERVISOR PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800